

Remarks

Claim Status:

Claims 1-4, 8-17, 19-29 and 31-38 remain pending in the application.

Some of the claims have been amended in an editorial manner without prejudice or forfeiture of any equivalent arrangements. For example, the amendments to some of the claims remove the terms “the steps of” or “step,” etc.

Some amendments further broaden the scope of the claims. For example, in claim 20, the term “website” has been broadened to “system.” And in claims 31 and 38 the term “document” has been removed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include some of the features of claims 5-7, claim 10 has been amended to include some of the features of now canceled claim 18 and claim 24 has been amended to include features of now canceled claim 30. Amended claim 24 is believed broader than original claim 30.

Specification Amendments:

The specification has been amended to insert publication and patent numbers and to address minor typos. At paragraph [0033] the specification has been amended to reflect the current address of Digimarc Corporation. Paragraph [0062] has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Replacement Drawing Sheet:

A Replacement Drawing Sheet for FIG. 1 is provided here to address the Examiner’s helpful suggestion (i.e., adding reference number “24”).

Double-Patenting Rejection:

Some of the claims have been provisionally rejected over U.S. Patent Application No. 09/853,835, our parent application. We respectfully traverse this rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of this rejection we are providing a terminal disclaimer over any patent issuing from the '835 application. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejection:

Claims 1-38 stand rejected over Philyaw (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,404). We respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below:

Claim 20

Claim 20 recites a method of authenticating permission to access a system via the internet. The method includes receiving a request to enter the system, the request including at least a validation key; *determining whether the validation key has been previously received*; and allowing access to the system based on a determination of said determining.

The Office Action on page 7, paragraph 9, fails to even address the feature of determining whether the validation key has been previously received, and allowing access based on this determination.

Moreover, Philyaw is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination. For example, while a VEMP 3002 may be assigned a sequential number when received, with the number being compared to a predetermined range of numbers (see Col. 31, lines 29-35), the system does not appear to determine whether the VEMP 3002 has been previously received, in combination with the remaining features of the claim.

We respectfully request that claim 20 be allowed.

Claims 31 and 38

Claim 31 recites a method of operating a computer server. The computer server communicates with at least one user terminal. The method includes receiving a document identifier from the user terminal; identifying a pointer associated with the document identifier; determining whether the pointer is a predetermined class, and if not the predetermined class, communicating the pointer to the user terminal; and if the predetermined class, generating a validation key, and communicating the pointer and validation key to the user terminal.

Many of these features were not discussed by the Office in its paragraph 10 (pages 7-8). For example, Philyaw is not understood to handle communicating to the user in different manners depending on the whether the *pointer* falls within a predetermined class.

An analogous argument can be made with respect to claim 38.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

A method of authenticating permission to access a system. The method includes receiving a request to enter the system, the request including at least a validation key; determining whether the validation key is valid; and allowing access to the system based on a determination of the determining. The validation key includes a time stamp and the determining *determines whether the time stamp includes a predetermined format*.

Philyaw is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination. For example, while Philyaw may contemplate time stamps (see Col. 30, lines 55-65), a determination is not based on a whether a time stamp *includes a predetermined format*.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 now recites that the central server encodes the validation key through at least one of i) hashing, ii) rotating and iii) converting the validation key to alpha-characters and then adjusting the characters according to a code key, in combination with the remaining claim features.

Philyaw is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 24

Claim 24 now recites a system for exchanging data including a central server that generates a validation key *including at least one of a random and pseudo-random number*, in combination with its other features. Philyaw is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination of features. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Dependent Claims

Many of the dependent claims recite patentable combinations in their own right.
Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement:

An Information Disclosure Statement is filed concurrently herewith. Consideration of the documents cited therein is respectfully requested.

Conclusion:

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at 503-469-4685 with any questions.

Date: March 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 23735

Phone: 503-469-4685
FAX: 503-469-4777

By


Steven W. Stewart
Registration No. 45,133